

TED KACZYNSKI
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

Item #31

January 14, 1999

Dear Beau,
Regarding Alston Chase — see the enclosed copy of a letter that I've sent him. If Chase asks you for permission to quote from my book in his book, you're at liberty to give him that permission if you like. I take no position as to whether he should be given such permission or not. Any ~~negotiation~~ negotiation on that subject is between you and him, and anything that you two decide will be alright with me.

*

Regarding Waits's book — Two ~~pe~~ different people have told me that Waits has made a certain claim that is a whopping lie and should be easy to disprove. I just have to get solid confirmation that he did make this claim, and then someone has to challenge him to produce the evidence he claims to have. If he doesn't produce it, that fact will expose him to great suspicion, and if he does produce it, it should be easy to prove he's a liar.

The only trouble is that for somewhat arcane legal reasons, it might be risky for me to discuss this evidence myself at present, but I think a lawyer could deal with this matter for me without exposing me to risk. However, since I have more-or-less fired Bonnie, and since he had told me he was too busy to give much time to my case anyway, the only lawyers I have now who might handle this matter for me are Quin Denvir and Judy Clarke. I'm

asking them to deal with it, but they too are busy and I don't know how much time they'll be able to spend on it.

However that may be, I've worked ~~myself~~ through the first 46 pages of Waits's book, making notes on the majority of the false statements as I go, and, luckily for me, it appears that Waits is a clumsy liar. Anyone who might make a thorough study of the documents in my case should find Waits's account implausible. Unfortunately, for legal reasons, this is not the time to make the documents public.

However, I've found several inaccuracies that can be proved without recourse to the documents. The ~~majority~~ majority of these Waits might pass off as honest mistakes, but a few are provable lies. The best of these occurs on p 36, where Waits says that an aluminum pipe ran through the wall of my cabin to my garden. No such pipe existed, and it should be easy to get proof of this. Since Waits ~~says~~ ^{indicates} he saw the pipe himself, this could hardly be an ^{honest} mistake on his part. This provides proof that Waits was lying when he says he saw my cabin when I was still living in it. He apparently visited my land after the cabin was gone, but it's clear he never saw the cabin in its place on my land, else he could not have made that mistake about the pipe.

*

Now here's what I think I want to do about the Waits problem. In the first place,

I don't want to make a mountain out of a molehill by publishing any sort of detailed enumeration of the falsehoods in Waits's book. Ideally I would like to identify just a few provable lies of Waits's that, when made public, would be sufficient to show him up as a liar. (As indicated above, I already have one such provable lie, if I can get Quin and Judy to do the necessary investigative work.)

~~Also, I think you're right when you say~~

Also, — and I think you will agree with this — I think it's unnecessary to publish a rebuttal in any periodical of national circulation unless Waits's book gets national attention. However, I do think I have to publish a rebuttal that will reach the same market that Waits's book will reach. I could accomplish this by sending a letter to the editor of the Missoulian (there's the Western Montana market). Waits's book will also be read nationwide ~~the~~ by people who take a special interest in my case, such as the Internet groupies and certain kinds of anarchists. I should be able to reach this market by publishing something in a small, radical periodical such as the Earth First! Journal, or Green Anarchist.

But there's another market that will be exposed to Waits's book. Rick Sallinger has visited Lincoln and has interviewed Waits and my neighbors, and the . . . He is probably going to do a TV news piece on the

Waits book. But in his letter to me, of Jan. 7, Sallinger expressed great skepticism about Waits's claims.

Now I know that you found Sallinger an unpleasant person when you talked to him, and you found he was motivated by self-interest. Of course, in my opinion the only safe assumption is that any media person is motivated by self-interest. But I think Sallinger's self-interest can prove useful to us.

In the first place, it's in his interest to play straight with us, because by providing him with information (and possibly very brief interviews) we can make ourselves very useful to him, and he won't want to throw that away by screwing us. In the second place, he seems disposed to investigate this Waits affair and is apparently very skeptical of Waits's claims. And it seems fairly clear to me that he can make a bigger splash and better promote his career as a journalist by broadcasting a piece that endeavors to sort out the truth from the lies, than by simply touting Waits's book ~~or~~ or by just putting me down as everyone else has done.

So I think it is to our advantage to help and encourage Sallinger to investigate Waits and his book. (Without, of course, giving him more information than is necessary for that purpose.) Thus, I propose to write to Sallinger and give him some relevant information, and I'm going to ask Quin and Judy to cooperate with him --

cautiously and only for the purpose of investigating Waits. If you're ever in touch with Sallinger again, I would appreciate it if you would be polite to him. You can give him info related to Waits or his book to the extent you think it's safe. I don't mind if you tell him you're publishing my book, but don't tell him anything about the content.

I'm also going to tell Sallinger about Michael Mello's book. There should be no harm in that since the fact that Michael is publishing such a book has already been made public. If Sallinger wants to interview Michael about the book, that's fine with me. I would have no objection to Sallinger's seeing the manuscript, since that has now been "censored".

Please let me know what you think about all this. I'll be glad to have your comments.

Here's the name and address of someone at Lincoln with whom I've been corresponding. I don't remember whether I've given you this info before, but anyway it's

Whenever you want any info about Waits or about Lincoln affairs in general, you'll find her very useful.

Best regards,

Ted